



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/611,934	07/07/2000	Gal Ashour	ARC-00-0040-US1	7329

7590 09/18/2003

Samuel A Kassatly
6819 Trinidad Drive
San Jose, CA 95120

EXAMINER

ELISCA, PIERRE E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3621

DATE MAILED: 09/18/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/611,934	Applicant(s) Gal Ashour et al.
	Examiner Pierre E. Elisca	Art Unit 3621
<i>-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --</i>		
Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>THREE</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.		
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).		
Status		
1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06/30/2003</u> .		
2a) <input type="checkbox"/> This action is FINAL. 2b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This action is non-final.		
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims		
4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are pending in the application.		
4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.		
5) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.		
6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are rejected.		
7) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.		
8) <input type="checkbox"/> Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.		
Application Papers		
9) <input type="checkbox"/> The specification is objected to by the Examiner.		
10) <input type="checkbox"/> The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) <input type="checkbox"/> accepted or b) <input type="checkbox"/> objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
11) <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) <input type="checkbox"/> approved b) <input type="checkbox"/> disapproved by the Examiner. If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.		
12) <input type="checkbox"/> The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
13) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) <input type="checkbox"/> All b) <input type="checkbox"/> Some* c) <input type="checkbox"/> None of: 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____. 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.		
14) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e). a) <input type="checkbox"/> The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.		
15) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.		
Attachment(s)		
1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____		
4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____		
5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)		
6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____		

Art Unit: 3621

DETAILED ACTION

RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT

1. This Office action is in response to Applicant's Response, filed 06/30/2003.

2. Claims 1-17 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. **The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:**

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over He et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 6,088,451) and Hess et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,471,670) in view of Sonderegger (U.S. Pat. No. 5,893,118).**

As per claims 1, 2, 3 , 5-13 and 15-17 He discloses a system/method for securing access to network elements by user elements, wherein the network elements and the user elements are coupled to a network. A network security server coupled to the network security to control access to the network elements and protec network resources and information (which is seen to read as Applicant's

Art Unit: 3621

claimed invention wherein it is stated that a system for assisting a user conducting a transaction on a secure site of a server to logoff), comprising:

the server including:

a secure transaction protection module that tracks a user's access state to the server (see., abstract, lines 7-13, fig 2, please note that user credentials or privileges also include Web site);

a database in communication with the secure transaction protection module, for storing data to be accessed by the user (see., abstract, lines 14-16, col 2, lines 12-34);

an identification module for validating the user's access to the database (see., abstract, line 7-13, col 2, lines 12-34); and

a notification module for notifying the secure transaction protection module of a user's request to initiate a session on the server (see., col 31, lines 3038).

It is to be noted that He does not explicitly disclose wherein if the user exists the secure site, the notification module sends a message to the secure transaction protection module for logging off the user from the secure site (which is interpreted as if the user exits its initial site notify the central controller. However, Hess discloses a multiple site communication system for determining when hand off a communication that is occurring on one communication resource to another communication resource. When the system or unit exits initial site notify the central controller (see., col 5, lines 14-29). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the security system of He by including the limitations detailed above

Art Unit: 3621

because such modification would provide the security system of He with the enhanced capability of notifying when a user exists the central controller or (secure site).

He and Hess fail to explicitly disclose the implicit logoff process. As stated by Applicant in page 5 of the response, filed on 06/30/2003. Implicit logoff reduces the risk to a user resulting from choosing an insecure site while logged onto on a secure site. However, Sonderegger discloses a useful programs that cannot freely access the disk, RAM, and other system resources. Applets (or implicit logoff) can only look at and download from the site where the applet was originally located. This was designed as a security feature in that the Web site the applet came from is deemed secure, while all other sites are presumed to be insecure, and therefore, the Applet is readable as an implicit logoff (see., col 2, lines 13-24). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of He and Hess by including the limitation detailed above because this would ensure that a user has a valid applet.

As per claims 4 and 14 He , Hess, and Sonderegger disclose the claimed limitation as stated in claims 1 and 2 above. It is to be noted that **He, Hess, and Sonderegger** do not explicitly disclose a cookie. However, the Examiner hereby take Official notice that Cookie is well-known in the art, and therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of **He, Hess, and Sonderegger** by including a cookie because it would provide with the enhanced necessary to control the network security based a cookie distribution.

Art Unit: 3621

However, Hess discloses a multiple site communication system/method for determining when to hand off a communication. When the communication exits its initial site notify the central controller (see., abstract, col 5, lines 13-29). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the network security of He by including the limitation detailed above as taught by Hess because such modification would monitor and identify the communication resources using cookie security system.

RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS

5. Applicant's argument filed on 06/30/2003 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of new ground (s) of rejection.

CONCLUSION

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to Pierre Eddy Elisca at (703) 305-3987. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday to Friday from 6:30AM to 5:00PM.

If any attempt to reach the examiner by telephone is unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on (703) 305-9768.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents or Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Application/Control Number: 09/611,934

Page 6

Art Unit: 3621

The Official Fax Number For TC-3600 is:

(703) 305-7687



Pierre Eddy Elisca

Patent Examiner

September 12, 2003